#### Case 2:13-cv-02377-JS Document 1 Filed 04/30/13 Page 1 of 13

SJS 44 (Rev. 12/07, NJ 5/08)

#### **CIVIL COVER SHEET**

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil declert sheet. (SEE DISTRICTIONS ON THE PEYERS OF THE FORM)

the civil docket sheet. (SEE I	NSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)					
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS		DEFENDANTS				
STEPHEN and LISA (	COCKING	NCO FINANCIA	NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC.			
(b) County of Residence	e of First Listed Plaintiff	County of Residence of	County of Residence of First Listed Defendant			
(c) Attorney's (Firm Na	ame, Address, Telephone Number and Email Ad	dress)  NOTE: IN LAN	D CONDEMNATION CASES, U	SE THE LOCATION OF THE		
Craig Thor Kimmel, E Kimmel & Silverman, 30 E. Butler Pike Ambler, PA 19002 (215) 540-8888			INVOLVED.			
II. BASIS OF JURISI	OICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	III. CITIZENSHIP OF P	PRINCIPAL PARTIES	(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff		
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	■ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)		TF DEF 1			
U.S. Government Defendant	<ul> <li>4 Diversity         (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)     </li> </ul>	Citizen of Another State	2			
		Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	3			
CONTRACT	T (Place an "X" in One Box Only) TORTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES		
□ 110 Insurance □ 120 Marine □ 130 Miller Act □ 140 Negotiable Instrument □ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	Slander 348 Asbestos Person Liability Liability PERSONAL PROPEE 345 Marine Product Liability 371 Truth in Lending 350 Motor Vehicle 9750 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 385 Property Damag Product Liability 385 Property Damag	-	□ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 □ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157    PROPERTY RIGHTS □ 820 Copyrights □ 840 Trademark   SOCIAL SECURITY □ 861 HIA (1395ff) □ 862 Black Lung (923) □ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) □ 864 SSID Title XVI □ 865 RSI (405(g))   FEDERAL TAX SUITS □ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) □ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	400 State Reapportionment   410 Antitrust   430 Banks and Banking   450 Commerce   460 Deportation   470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations   480 Consumer Credit   490 Cable/Sat TV   810 Selective Service   850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange   875 Customer Challenge   12 USC 3410   890 Other Statutory Actions   891 Agricultural Acts   892 Economic Stabilization Act   893 Environmental Matters   894 Energy Allocation Act   895 Freedom of Information Act   900 Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice   950 Constitutionality of State Statutes		
<b>又</b> 1 Original □ 2 R	tate Court  Appellate Court  Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you a 15 U.S.C SECTION 1692  Brief description of cause:	Reopened another special another special are filing (Do not cite jurisdictions)	al statutes unless diversity):  CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND	Magnitude Judgment  Title demanded in complaint:		
Explanation:	JUDGE		DOCKET NUMBER _			

DATE SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD

04/30/2013

#### Case 2:13-cv-02377-JS Document 1 Filed 04/30/13 Page 2 of 13

# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

#### CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

STEPHEN and LISA COCKING

	:	: CIVIL ACTION	
V.	:	: : NO.	
NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEM	MS, INC.	:	:
plaintiff shall complete a Ca filing the complaint and serve side of this form.) In the e designation, that defendant sl plaintiff and all other parties, that defendant believes the ca	se Management Trace a copy on all defendent that a defendanall, with its first apparagement ase should be assigned.		the time of the reverse garding said serve on the
SELECT ONE OF THE FO	DLLOWING CASE	E MANAGEMENT TRACKS:	
(a) Habeas Corpus – Cases b	rought under 28 U.S	S.C. § 2241 through § 2255.	( )
(b) Social Security – Cases re and Human Services den	-	a decision of the Secretary of Health Security Benefits.	( )
(c) Arbitration – Cases requi	red to be designated	for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53	3.2. (X)
(d) Asbestos – Cases involvi exposure to asbestos.	ng claims for person	al injury or property damage from	( )
commonly referred to as	complex and that nee	into tracks (a) through (d) that are ed special or intense management by detailed explanation of special	
management cases.)			( )
(f) Standard Management –	Cases that do not fal	l into any one of the other tracks.	( )
04/30/2013 Date	Craig Thor Kimme Attorney-at-law	Plaintiffs, Lisa & Stephen Cocki Attorney for	<u>ng</u>
<u>215-540-8888</u>	877-788-2864	kimmel@creditlaw.com	
Telephone	FAX Number	E-Mail Address	

(Civ. 660) 10/02

# Case 2:13-cv-02377-JS, Document 1, Filed 04/30/13 Page 3 of 13

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to appropriate calendar. Address of Plaintiff: 921 Olaf Street, Big Rapids, MI 49307 Address of Defendant: 507 Prudential Road, Horsham, PA 19044 Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: (Use Reverse Side For Additional Space) Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation and any publicly held corporation owning 10% or more of its stock? Yes□ No⊠ (Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a)) NoX Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities? Ves RELATED CASE, IF ANY: Case Number: Judge \_ Date Terminated: Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions: 1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? 2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? No 3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously NoX terminated action in this court? 4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights case filed by the same individual? No CIVIL: (Place / in ONE CATEGORY ONLY) A. Federal Question Cases: B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases: 1. 

Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 1. □ Insurance Contract and Other Contracts 2. 

Airplane Personal Injury 2. 

FELA 3. 

Jones Act-Personal Injury 3. 

Assault, Defamation 4. 

Antitrust □ Marine Personal Injury 5. Patent 5. 

Motor Vehicle Personal Injury 6. □ Labor-Management Relations 6. □ Other Personal Injury (Please specify) 7. Civil Rights 7. D Products Liability 8. 

Habeas Corpus 8. 

Products Liability — Asbestos 9. □ Securities Act(s) Cases 9. 

All other Diversity Cases 10. □ Social Security Review Cases (Please specify) 11. M All other Federal Question Cases (Please specify) 15 U.S.C. § 1692 ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION (Check Appropriate Category) I, Craig Thor Kimmel , counse of record do hereby certify: □ Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs; Relief other than monetary damages is sought. 57100 DATE: 04/30/2013 Attorney-at-Law Attorney I.D.# NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38. I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court except as noted above.

57100

Attorney I.D.#

CIV. 609 (5/2012)

DATE: 04/30/2013

Attorne

### 1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE 2 EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA 3 4 STEPHEN and LISA COCKING, 5 Plaintiffs 6 Case No.: v. 7 NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC., 8 COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR **JURY TRIAL** 9 Defendant (Unlawful Debt Collection Practices) 10 11 **COMPLAINT** 12 STEPHEN and LISA COCKING ("Plaintiffs"), by and through their 13 14 attorneys, KIMMEL & SILVERMAN, P.C., allege the following against NCO 15 FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC. ("Defendant"): 16 17 INTRODUCTION 18 19 Plaintiffs' Complaint is based on the Fair Debt Collection Practices 1. 20 Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. ("FDCPA"), which prohibits debt collectors from 21 engaging in abusive, deceptive, and unfair practices. 22 23 24 25 -1-

## JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 2. Jurisdiction of this court arises pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(d), which states that such actions may be brought and heard before "any appropriate United States district court without regard to the amount in controversy," and 28 U.S.C. § 1331 grants this court original jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the laws of the United States.
- 3. Defendant conducts business and has its principal office in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and therefore, personal jurisdiction is established.
  - 4. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1).

#### **PARTIES**

- 5. Plaintiffs are natural persons residing in Big Rapids, Michigan 49307.
- 6. Plaintiff Stephen Cocking (hereinafter "Mr. Cocking") is a "consumer" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).
- 7. Plaintiff Lisa Cocking (hereinafter "Mrs. Cocking") is a person granted a cause of action under the FDCPA. See 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a) and Wenrich v. Cole, 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 18687 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 22, 2000).
- 8. Defendant is a national debt collection company with its corporate headquarters located at 507 Prudential Road in Horsham, Pennsylvania, 19044.

9. Defendant is a "debt collector" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6), and repeatedly contacted Plaintiffs in an attempt to collect a debt.

10. Defendant acted through its agents, employees, officers, members, directors, heirs, successors, assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees, representatives, and insurers.

#### **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

- 10. At all relevant times, Defendant was attempting to collect an alleged consumer debt and contacted Plaintiffs to collect that debt.
- 11. The alleged debt, a Credit One Bank, N.A. credit account, arose out of transactions, which were primarily for personal, family, or household purposes.
- 12. As Plaintiffs have no business debt, the debt sought by Defendant could have only been personal in nature.
- 13. Beginning in March 2013, and continuing through August 6, 2013, Defendant repeatedly and continuously contacted Plaintiffs on their home telephone in an attempt to collect a consumer debt.
- 14. During this time, Defendant contacted Plaintiffs daily, sometimes calling them as frequently as four times a day.
- 15. When contacting Plaintiffs, Defendant would call at times when it was inconvenient for them to receive collection calls, specifically calling after

9:00 p.m. on more than one occasion.

- 16. Not wanting to receive any further collection calls, Plaintiffs would answer the phone and inform Defendant's collectors to stop calling them.
- 17. Defendant refused to update its records and/or remove Plaintiffs' number from its call list in order to stop the calls. Rather, Defendant persisted in calling, the only purpose for was to harass.
- 18. Additionally, Defendant did not appropriately identify itself as a debt collector at the start of a conversation; rather, the collector began to speak when the phone was answered, saying in a familiar tone such things as: "Stephen, are you going to pay this today?"
- 19. The account Defendant was seeking to collect allegedly totaled \$893.82, for credit card debt with a \$300.00 limit. At the time of last payment, November 2012, a balance of only \$214.00 remained.
- 20. As such, upon information and belief, Defendant sought to collect an amount greater than the amount of the debt, an amount not provided for under the agreement creating the relationship between the parties.
- 21. Further, when Plaintiffs refused to pay, Defendant threatened to take legal action against Mr. Cocking.
- 22. Upon information and belief, Defendant did not intend to take legal action, as it was not authorized to take such action and legally could not take the

action it threatened.

- 23. Defendant made the threats to take legal action for the sole purpose to intimidate, scare and intimidate Plaintiffs into making payment on an inflated figure nearly four times the actual balance on account.
- 24. Further, even after speaking with Plaintiffs, Defendant's collectors contacted Mr. Cocking's in-laws and claimed they were "looking for Stephen Cocking" and "calling to collect" money, when, in fact, they had already spoken to the debtor.
- 25. Defendant's calls to third-party family members were not placed to secure location information, but rather to embarrass, abuse, and humiliate Plaintiffs.
- 26. When calling Mr. Cocking's in-laws, Defendant called five (5) times on the same day, and each disclosed that they were calling from "NCO Financial Systems, Inc."
- 27. It was embarrassing and harassing to Plaintiffs to have information about a debt disclosed to Mr. Cocking's in-laws, and Plaintiffs do not discuss their personal finances with his in-laws.
- 28. Further, at no time did Plaintiffs give Defendant permission to disclose information related to the alleged debt to any third party, including Mr. Cocking's in-laws.

# DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT

29. In its actions to collect a disputed debt, Defendant violated the FDCPA in one or more of the following ways:

#### **COUNT I**

- 30. Defendant's conduct, detailed in the preceding paragraphs, violated 15 U.S.C. §§1692c(a)(1) and 1692c(b).
  - A debt collector violates §1692c(a)(1) of the FDCPA by communicating with a consumer in connection with the collection of any debt at any unusual time or place or a time or place known or which should be known to be inconvenient to the consumer. In absence of knowledge of circumstances to the contrary, a debt collector shall assume that the convenient time for communicating with a consumer is after 8:00 a.m. and before 9:00 p.m., local time at the consumer's location.
  - b. A debt collector violates §1692c(b) of the FDCPA by communicating, in connection with the collection of a debt, with any person other than the consumer, his attorney, a consumer reporting agency if otherwise permitted by law, the creditor, the attorney of the creditor, or the attorney of the debt

collector, without the prior consumer of the consumer given directly to the debt collector.

c. Here, Defendant violated §§1692c(a)(1) and 1692c(b) of the FDCPA by calling Plaintiffs after 9:00 p.m. and disclosing information about the debt to a third party without having received consent from Mr. Cocking.

#### **COUNT II**

- 31. Defendant's conduct, detailed in the preceding paragraphs, violated 15 U.S.C. §§1692d and 1692d(5).
  - a. Section 1692d of the FDCPA prohibits debt collectors from engaging in any conduct the natural consequences of which is to harass, oppress or abuse any person in connection with the collection of a debt.
  - b. Section 1692d(5) of the FDCPA prohibits debt collectors from causing a telephone to ring or engaging any person in telephone conversation repeatedly or continuously with the intent to annoy, abuse, or harass any person at the called number.
  - c. Defendant violated §§1692d and 1692d(5) of the FDCPA when it caused Plaintiffs' telephone to ring every day, calling them between one (1) to four (4) times each day, with the intent to

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

21

20

22

23

24

25

annoy, abuse and harass Plaintiffs.

#### **COUNT III**

- 32. Defendant's conduct, detailed in the preceding paragraphs, violated 15 U.S.C. §§1692e, 1692e(2)(A) and 1692e(5).
  - A debt collector violates §1692e of the FDCPA by using false, deceptive or misleading representations or means in connection with the collection of any debt.
  - b. A debt collector violates §1692e(2)(A) of the FDCPA by falsely representing the character, amount or legal status of any debt.
  - A debt collector violates §1692e(5) of the FDCPA by c. threatening to take any action that cannot legally be taken or that is not intended to be taken.
  - Here, Defendant violated §§1692e, 1692e(2)(A) and 1692e(5) d. of the FDCPA by misrepresenting the amount of the alleged debt and threatening to take legal action when it did not intend and/or did not have legal authority to take the action it threatened.

#### **COUNT IV**

33. Defendant's conduct, detailed in the preceding paragraphs, violated 15

U.S.C. §§1692f and 1692f(1).

- a. Section 1692f of the FDCPA prohibits a debt collector from using unfair or unconscionable means to collect or attempt to collect any debt.
- b. A debt collector violates §1692f(1) of the FDCPA by collecting an amount (including any interest, fee, charge, or expense incidental to the principal obligation) unless such amount is expressly authorized by the agreement creating the debt or permitted by law.
- c. Defendant violated §§1692f and 1692f(1) of the FDCPA when it failed to update its records to stop calling Plaintiffs and attempted to collect an amount different than what was permitted under the agreement creating the debt.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs, STEPHEN and LISA COCKING, respectfully pray for a judgment as follows:

- a. All actual damages suffered pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1692k(a)(1);
- b. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 for the violation of the FDCPA pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1692k(a)(2)(A);

#### Case 2:13-cv-02377-JS Document 1 Filed 04/30/13 Page 13 of 13

c.	All re	easonable	attorne	eys' fees,	wit	ness fees,	court cos	sts and	d
	other	litigation	costs	incurred	by	Plaintiffs	pursuant	to 1:	5
	U.S.C	C. §1693k(a	a)(3); a	nd					

d. Any other relief deemed appropriate by this Honorable Court.

#### **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiffs, STEPHEN and LISA COCKING, demand a jury trial in this case.

DATED: 04/30/13

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

RESPECTFULDY SUBMITTED,

KIMMEL & SILVERMAN, P.C.

By:

CRAIG THOR KIMMEL Attorney ID # 57100 30 E. Butler Pike Ambler, PA 19002

Phone: (215) 540-8888 ext. 103

Fax: (877) 788-2864

Email: <u>kimmel@creditlaw.com</u>